

both at home and abroad. We, as a people, cherish our freedom and should honor those who have helped secure for us, and for those who will follow us, the freedom to pursue opportunity, the freedom to challenge inequality, and the freedom to actively and peacefully participate in the political process.

Let the actions and poignant words of Dr. King serve as an example to us as well as the generations to come, that it is possible to dream and, through persistence and dedication, to realize those dreams. But let us not only commemorate these words, but continue to work to make Dr. King's dream a reality.

As we commemorate the 40th Anniversary of the March on Washington, let us remember the struggles of those who came before us, and in so doing, help fully realize their dream so that one day our children will truly "live in a nation where they will not be judged by the color of their skin but by the content of their character."

#### CLARIFICATION OF SCOPE AND CONCLUSIONS OF PROFESSOR GUSTON'S STUDY

**HON. RUSH D. HOLT**

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Wednesday, September 17, 2003*

Mr. HOLT. Mr. Speaker, on May 7 of this year, the House debated and passed an important piece of legislation, the Nanotechnology Research and Development Act of 2003 (H.R. 766). During debate of this bill, it became clear that there was a misunderstanding regarding the conclusions of a scholarly study conducted at Rutgers University. The author of that study, which was cited during the debate, has written to me with the request that he be able to clear up the confusion.

I am enclosing for the record the attached letter from David Guston, Associate Professor and Director of the Public Policy Program at Rutgers. Professor Guston's letter clarifies the scope and conclusions of his study, and will help us move forward on issues related to nanotechnology in an informed and thoughtful way in the future.

RUTGERS, EDWARD J. BLOUSTEIN  
SCHOOL OF PLANNING AND PUBLIC  
POLICY, PUBLIC POLICY PROGRAM,  
New Brunswick, NJ, September 17, 2003.

Hon. RUSH HOLT,  
Longworth House Office Bldg.,  
Washington, DC.

DEAR REPRESENTATIVE HOLT: I write regarding the debate on the House floor on 7 May on the Nanotechnology Research and Development Act of 2003 (H.R. 766).

It has come to my attention that, in responding to Representative Johnson's proposed amendment to the bill to provide for regularly occurring consensus conferences or citizens' panels, Representative Burgess cited (at CR H3727) "[a] scholarly review of the Danish-type citizens' panel process convened to study telecommunications and democracy [that] judged the process to be ineffective."

In later remarks on the amendment, Chairman Boehlert referred to the same "scholarly study," saying that he was told the study "concluded that not even those engaged in organizing the US citizens' panel thought it had any impact." Chairman Boehlert then quoted from the study the fol-

lowing passage (at CR H3727-28): "The single greatest area of consensus among the respondents was that the Citizens' Panel on Telecommunications and the Future of Democracy had no actual impact. No respondent, not even those government members of the steering committee or expert cohort, identified any actual impact."

I am the author of the study in question (which can be found in pre-published form at <http://policy.rutgers.edu/papers/> and via <http://www.loka.org/pages/panel/htm> and in peer-reviewed, published from in Science, Technology, & Human Values 24(4):451-82). I believe that these comments indicate real confusion about my findings. I am therefore writing to correct the record and to ensure that no misunderstanding about my study damages efforts to provide public input into the future of nanotechnology R&D.

There are three important aspects of my study on the Citizens' Panel on Telecommunications and the Future of Democracy of which you should be aware.

First, the study concludes that the citizens' panel had no actual impact on policy decisions because, in large part, it was not designed to. The sentence from the study immediately following the one Chairman Boehlert quotes reads: "A primary reason for this lack of impact is that having one was not a primary goal of the citizens' panel." The organizers of the panel designed it as a proof-of-concept, and they were more interested in understanding how to implement such a panel and in seeing how the experts and lay-citizens would interact than they were in having an actual impact on policy. Although conducting citizens' panels is not quite rocket science, questioning their effectiveness by claiming that this panel did not have an actual impact is like blaming the Gemini program for not going to the Moon: Its designers did not intend it to do so.

Second, my study distinguishes between what I call "actual impact," defined as "a concrete consequence to any authoritative public decision," and three other impacts: (1) those on the "general thinking" about a problem; (2) those on the "training of knowledgeable personnel"; and (3) those that result in an "interaction with lay-knowledge." I develop these other measures to evaluate the impact of citizens' panels for two reasons: (1) because—just as with more traditional research—the education of participants is a primary output of citizens' panels; and (2) because even very formal, expert studies such as those conducted by the National Academy of Sciences or by national commissions often fail to have an "actual impact." The comments made in the floor debate by members of both parties emphasize that scientists and lay-citizens need to learn from each other about nanotechnology, and my study finds that such learning can indeed occur in citizens' panels. To question the effectiveness of citizens' panels by pointing to no "actual impact" of this pilot panel misses the study's finding of "tantalizing evidence that many kinds of impacts can be achieved."

Third—and most importantly—rather than undermining the possibility of providing public input into technical decisions, my research concludes that citizens panels are real opportunities for productive interaction between experts and lay-citizens. My research concludes that future citizens' panels would need better "connection to non-participants" and "higher profile institutional partners" in order to achieve their potential. If citizens' panels were authorized by H.R. 766 and conducted by NSF and its partner agencies, then they would indeed have the institutional support my research indicates they require to succeed.

I hope that the record can be corrected to indicate that my research provides evidence

and analysis to support the productive use of citizens' panels under the conditions that H.R. 766 envisions them, rather than providing evidence against their effectiveness.

Please let me know if I may be of any assistance on such matters in the future, and I thank you for your work on H.R. 766 and for your attention here.

Sincerely,

DAVID H. GUSTON,  
Associate Professor and Director.

#### COMMEMORATING THE 12TH ANNIVERSARY OF THE INDEPENDENCE OF THE REPUBLIC OF ARMENIA

**HON. ERIC CANTOR**

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Wednesday, September 17, 2003*

Mr. CANTOR. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to commemorate the 12th anniversary of Armenia's independence from the Soviet Union. For many years, and on many fronts, the people of Armenia have been challenged; for their land, for their distinct heritage and culture and have endured the most atrocious of events, genocide.

On September 21, 1991, after the fall of the Soviet Union, a lifelong dream of many Armenians was finally within sight. The country achieved its independence after an astounding 94 percent of its voters turned out in support of Armenia's sovereignty. We would like to join with the Republic of Armenia in celebrating its 12th anniversary of independence and welcome the growing ties between our two countries.

Since 1991, relations between our two nations have been prosperous. Our common struggle against communism reflects the shared values between Armenians and Americans alike. We have also developed strong economic relations; the addition of Armenia to the World Trade Organization earlier this year demonstrates its commitment to free enterprise and lower barriers to trade. Armenia has also been a strong advocate of sustained stability in the Transcaucas region; it has made significant contributions to the Organization for Security and Cooperation in Europe's peace process for Nagorno-Karabagh.

Lastly, I would like to wish Armenians across the globe well on the day of their independence. I believe that with the continuing support of the United States, Armenia will prosper and continue to be a loyal friend to our country.

#### INTRODUCTION OF THE FREEDOM TO ESTABLISH STATE HIGH AIR QUALITY ACT OF 2003

**HON. MARK UDALL**

OF COLORADO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Wednesday, September 17, 2003*

Mr. UDALL of Colorado. Mr. Speaker, today I am introducing the "Freedom to Establish State High Air Quality (FrESH AIR Quality)" Act. I'm pleased that my colleague from Connecticut, Representative CHRIS SHAYS, is joining me as an original cosponsor of the bill.

This bill is designed to preserve the ability of States, Indian tribes, municipalities, and air

pollution control agencies to protect the public health and the environment. Specifically, it would give them discretion as to whether or not to implement the EPA's August 27, 2003 new source review revisions.

There is no question that our Nation's environmental laws have improved the health, safety and environmental quality of communities across the country. These laws have served us well. Of course, there is always room for improvement, and I am committed to working collaboratively to make sure our environmental laws not only work effectively to bring about environmental and health and safety improvements, but also allow our economy to prosper.

Environmental protection and economic prosperity are not mutually exclusive—in fact, they go hand-in-hand.

However, I'm concerned that the EPA's August revisions tip the balance, and do so in a way that puts the quality of our air at unacceptable risk.

The Clean Air Act allowed for routine maintenance of old, dirty electrical plants and other facilities, while requiring that more extensive changes in these plants would require installation of modern anti-pollution technology. This compromise was intended to allow a smooth transition, not to persist forever. The so-called new source review regulations were designed to draw a line between routine maintenance and the kind of changes that would require the installation of this newer anti-pollution technology.

Some revisions to these regulations might be appropriate. However, the revisions finalized in August, in my opinion, are out of balance. They would allow continued emission of airborne contaminants for many years after such pollution should have become history.

Millions of Americans, including the elderly and young children who are most vulnerable to air pollution, live close to the nearly 17,000 industrial facilities that would be shielded by this radical change in policy. But there would be no incentive for the owners of these facilities to make the investment needed to reduce or prevent continued emission of harmful airborne contaminants.

This is an abdication of the Federal Government's responsibility. But this new policy goes even further. It requires all States to adopt these new regulations in total.

In other words, the new rules would take away the States' legal ability under the Clean Air Act to develop programs that are more protective of health, safety and the environment than required by Federal regulations. This flies in the face of the Clean Air Act and of the principle of State flexibility. Instead of a regulatory "floor" which ensures some minimum level of protection for public health and the environment, these new regulations would create a floor, a ceiling and walls that would hem in every State, every Indian tribe, and every air pollution control agency.

My bill would tear down that structure. It would allow State, tribal, and local officials to decide whether to adopt these new EPA regulations as a "floor," or instead to maintain their current clean air programs—and it reestablishes the principle that these entities can go further to establish more stringent requirements to protect the health and safety of their citizens. They have this option right now under the Clean Air Act, and they should continue to have that flexibility, without fear of Federal

punishment or discouragement. It would be their choice.

Mr. Speaker, I believe that we must continue to make progress in improving our air quality, and we should continue to do so through partnerships between the Federal agencies, the States and Indian tribes. The new EPA rules would undermine those partnerships. My bill would preserve them and allow the Federal Government's partners to do all that they can to protect the public and the environment.

For the benefit of my colleagues, I am attaching a section-by-section digest of the bill.

#### THE FREEDOM TO ESTABLISH STATE HIGH AIR QUALITY ACT (FRESH AIR QUALITY ACT) SECTION-BY-SECTION

##### SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE

The bill is cited as the Freedom to Establish State High Air Quality (FrESH AIR Quality) Act.

##### SECTION 2. FINDINGS AND PURPOSE

The bill includes findings related to the August 27 new source review revisions, and states the bill's purpose: "The purpose of this Act is to preserve the ability of States, Indian tribes, municipalities, and air pollution control agencies to protect the public health and the environment by affording them discretion as to whether or not to implement the new source review revisions finalized by the EPA on August 27, 2003."

##### SECTION 3. PRESERVATION OF STATE AND TRIBAL AUTHORITY

The bill includes the following prohibitions:

(1) No State, Indian tribe, municipality, or air pollution control agency is required to implement or have implemented EPA's new source review revisions.

(2) No revision of a Federal implementation plan pursuant to the new revisions can take effect until the affected State, Indian tribe, municipality, or air pollution control agency notifies the EPA that it agrees to this revision.

(3) If a State, Indian tribe, municipality, or air pollution control agency does not implement the August 27 new source revisions or does not consent to revision of a Federal implementation plan pursuant to the new revisions, it is not subject to sanctions, to the revocation of an approved State implementation plan under the Clean Air Act, or to the imposition of a new or revised Federal implementation plan.

#### CONGRATULATIONS TO MISS CATHERINE CROSBY, MISS ALABAMA 2004

##### HON. JO BONNER

OF ALABAMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Wednesday, September 17, 2003*

Mr. BONNER. Mr. Speaker, this weekend, in Atlantic City, New Jersey, a young lady from my congressional district, Miss Catherine Crosby, will represent Alabama in the 2004 Miss America Pageant.

A native of Brewton, Catherine is the daughter of Larry and Ann Crosby. A 1998 graduate of T.R. Miller High School, she subsequently received her Bachelor of Arts degree in History from Auburn University in 2002.

Catherine was crowned Miss Alabama on the campus of Samford University in Birmingham, on June 14, 2003, following a week of preliminary competitions. The fifty pageant

participants competed in four areas of competition: interview, in which she received first place honors; swimsuit; evening wear; and talent. As Miss Alabama, Catherine regularly receives State and national recognition and was awarded an \$11,000 scholarship.

Prior to traveling to Atlantic City, Catherine stopped by my office and visited with the other Members of the Alabama Delegation as well. She is as charming and talented as she is beautiful, and I could not help but be impressed with what she has chosen as her pageant platform, "First Vote: America's Freedom to Choose."

This message teaches young people about the importance of voting and works to instill in them the responsibilities and obligations of being good citizens.

Mr. Speaker, Catherine's message could not come at a better time. I trust her words will help open the eyes of many young Americans about the right and privilege of voting . . . one of the many freedoms that, unfortunately, we all-too-often take for granted in this great country.

On behalf of an entire State that will be rooting her on and wishing her well, I salute Miss Alabama Catherine Crosby. I know she will make our entire State—and Nation—proud this Saturday night, and I predict we will be hearing much more from this wonderful young lady in the months and years to come.

#### CONGRATULATIONS

##### HON. RON PAUL

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Wednesday, September 17, 2003*

Mr. PAUL. Mr. Speaker, I rise to honor John and Geraldine Dettling, a couple with long-standing roots in the 14th congressional district of Texas. Mr. and Mrs. Dettling recently celebrated 60 years of marriage, an incredible milestone that deserves recognition and great respect. The longevity of their marriage serves as an inspiration for all couples today.

John Dettling and Geraldine Wendel met in south Texas more than 6 decades ago. They married in El Campo, Texas in 1943, on the eve of World War II. Less than 1 year later, John left for Europe as a soldier. Like many couples of the era, the war separated the young newlyweds for some time. Happily, John returned from the war safe and sound and they began a long life together. The couple built a home in Wharton, Texas, where they still live today.

Over the years the Dettlings were blessed with 6 children, along with (so far) 11 grandchildren and 6 great-grandchildren. John worked as a barber for 30 years, and then worked as a security guard for 6 years. Throughout the decades Geraldine worked hard at home raising the children; when they were older she embarked on a nursing career. Both enjoy retirement today.

I'm happy to report that the Dettlings' momentous 60th anniversary did not go unnoticed. They renewed their vows at Holy Family Catholic Church in Wharton. Afterward, an anniversary reception was held for the couple at the Wharton County Historical Museum, where they celebrated with family and 200 well-wishers.

Mr. Speaker, in today's transient world the Dettlings stand out as a couple who maintained both their marriage and their local roots